



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung. Von HERMANN USENER. Bonn, Friedrich Cohen, 1896.

The Andrians were the first of the islanders of whom Themistokles demanded money, as Herodotos tells us (8, 111). Thrifty people were the Andrians then, as they are now, and they did not yield to the demand; and when Themistokles said that the Athenians brought with them two great gods *Πεῖθώ τε καὶ Ἀναγκαίη*, the Andrians replied that they also had two gods *Πενίη τε καὶ Ἀμυχανίη*, gods that never left the island and ever haunted the place. The Athenian gods were rich and the Andrian gods were unprofitable, but Resourcelessness was and always would be too strong for Resource. These deities are what we call personifications, and we attach little importance to such transparent figures of speech, but it is precisely these transparent deities to which Professor Usener's book 'Götternamen' is destined to bring more abundant honor. In a well-known chapter of his Roman History Mommsen calls attention to the fact that the Romans paid the very highest honors to some of those very deities that are so cold and formal to us. 'In solchen äusserlich abgezogen Begriffen von der einfältigsten, halb ehrwürdigen, halb lächerlichen Schlichtheit ging die römische Theologie wesentlich auf,' but while he says that abstraction and personification are the essence of Greek theology also, he cites no examples for the Greek side. Compare Paus. 1, 17, 1 and the commentators on Pind. Pyth. 8, 1. Poets being themselves divine, had the right to beget gods, but it is necessary to distinguish between these extemporized gods and the gods that were of ancient lineage. So the *Πεῖθώ* and the *Ἀναγκαίη* of the Athenians were more or less real deities. The *Πενίη* and the *Ἀμυχανίη* of the Andrians were mere figments, and yet *Πενία* figures in Aristophanes, figures in Plato, and in a few more centuries might have been as truly a deity as *Πεῖθώ*. Now it is with these transparent gods that Professor Usener's fascinating volume has chiefly to do. The gods whose names hold no secret are subordinated to those whose names are veiled, and these originally independent deities become mere surnames to the great gods of Olympus. This is the general drift of the book in which Professor Usener has deposited the results of the study of many years. He has brought to the monumental work on Greek mythology, of which this volume covers only a section, wide and profound learning, a wonderful power of combination and a charming style. Those who have read the various monographs in which he has followed the traces of pagan tradition on the sands of the Bollandists will be prepared to welcome this ampler volume; and while the writer of this notice is not one of the specialists to whom, according to the advertisement of the Journal, such a work ought to be referred, still the subject recalls earlier studies of his own, and in default of a critical review the reader may

be not disinclined to accept as a temporary substitute a rapid outline of the contents.

The introductory chapter is headed 'Wort und Begriff.' A word is not a conventional mark, a mere token of the concept (νόμος), nor is it an adequate name for the thing itself and its essence (φύσει). It is a precipitate of impressions from without, a compendium or, if you choose, a fragment of a description. It is the predicate of an undefined subject that cannot yet be named, that can only be pointed at with the finger. All common nouns must have been originally adjectival in their nature, either real adjectives of quality and the like or *nomina agentis*. Now, are the names of the gods to be measured by the same standard? True, the progress of linguistic tempts the student to the analysis of these θεῖα ὀνόματα, but there have been so many mistakes, so many aberrations, that even now we may well heed the sober words of Herodian: οὐ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν κυρίων ἐτυμολογίας λαμβάνειν. We are then to take the names of the gods as so many data and simply follow the history of the changes to which they have been subjected. In this way we may hope, while studying the phenomena of modification and renewal, to learn something of the forces which were at work in the beginning.

Professor Usener's first chapter deals with the way in which the forms of Greek names increase and multiply. The black-hearted goatherd in the Odyssey is now Μελάνθιος, now Μελανθεύς, and when one comes to patronymics the Greek is apt to open his mouth wide, as commentators on Pind. Ol. 6, 15 have noticed. Ταλαΐδας becomes Ταλαϊονίδας. But these growths from a common stock have a tendency to differentiation, as Πλούτος and Πλούτων, and Κρόνος, Κρονίων, Κρονίδης, Ὑπερίων and Ὑπεριονίδης set up a genealogical relation that is nothing but a false inference from the form.

The next chapter has to do with the creation of female divinities. It is not good for a god, any more than it is for a man, to be alone. But in the Rigveda there are few female divinities, and the Vedic gods dispense with the process of birth. There are female figures enough, but these are only goddesses by courtesy, pale creatures, mere lunar rainbows to the gods, and Professor Usener sets up the thesis that, with the exception of two or three old goddesses whose sex was determined by the conception of their character, the Indo-Germanic peoples begat none but male deities, and that the female deities were mere inflexions of the masculine forms, and grew out of them as Eve was taken out of the side of Adam. The Romans in the *indigitamenta* turned out gods, as every one knows, male and female, with tiresome frequency. Every Jack had his Jill, every Faunus had his Fauna, and the Greek mythology, especially the heroic saga, is full of such couples as Γλαῦκος and Γλαῦκη, Ἰππόλυτος and Ἰππολύτη. Sometimes one is left a widower, sometimes one is left a widow, Ζεύς's spouse Δία is divorced from him. In epic poetry Ἑκάτος had to live without his Ἑκάτη, and in later times Ἑκάτη's good old god survived not in the mouth of the people, but merely in the realms of literature.

We have had thus far the variation of the word. We now take a step farther and come to the variation of the concept, a process which blends indistinguishably with the variation of the word. So, for instance, in a word like ἀλλόκοτος, like νέκοτος the Attics felt not so much a compound as a suffixal variation of ἄλλος and νέος. There is a class of compounds thrown off in swarms

by the lyric and tragic poets in which an original adjective receives, as it were, a determinative without losing anything of its primal force. Take, for instance, such a series as μέλας, μελάγχμιος, μελαγχίτων, μελαμβαθής, μελαμφάνης, μελανανγής, μελανόχρως. This is one of the most familiar features of Aeschylean diction, and the priest of Eleusis found models in the language of religious worship. So Ἑκατος became Ἐκάεργος, Ἐκηβόλος, Ἐκατηβόλος. Ἀρίστη, a surname of Artemis, became Ἀριστοβούλη and Ἀριστομάχη. Then the notion is not only varied and extended, but revived and refreshed by new formations. So the word παμφαής assumes a variety of forms. παμφαής is an appellation of the sun and moon, πασιφάεσσα of Aphrodite, and Παμφάης figures in a myth of the Dioskuroi. Πασιφάη is not only the daughter of Helios, but a Laconian moon-goddess, and Πάμφως, the mythical singer, was the inventor of lamplight.

We now pass on to the names of the gods the signification of which is transparent, and here our path is crossed by the peculiarity of the Roman religion, to which reference has been made already. The object of prayer demands that none of the gods shall be omitted whose help is needed to bring good or avert evil, just as schoolboys have to invoke all four evangelists to loose the knot of the cramp which the devil is tying in their legs. These names were all registered in the Roman prayer-books, in the *indigitamenta*, and hosts of these *di certi*, as Varro calls them, have come down to us. Professor Usener calls them 'Sondergötter.' Let us call them 'Specialist Gods.' They have each a definite function and every sphere of life is mapped out, every section assigned to a special divinity. Twelve gods, for instance, besides Tellus and Ceres, are invoked for the *sacrum cereale*, beginning with the god who breaks the fallow field, Veruactor, and winding up with Messor, Convector, Conditor, Promitor—all transparent enough. Seeds are intrusted to Seia, and Proserpina has care of the tender shoot that creeps up out of the earth. Flora presides over the flowers, Pomona is goddess of fruit, and Epona has charge of horses and mules, and instances might be multiplied indefinitely. Now, these are not, as Grassmann would have it, a weak aftergrowth of a popular religion that has been checked in its development. They show, as Mommsen has seen, the deep religious sense of the Italic peoples, and the persistency with which the Italics held to these forms, which we are apt to call bloodless abstractions, stands in striking contrast to the rapid disappearance of Italic myths before the face of Greek traditions. But this phenomenon does not stand alone, and we pass from the heathen of Italy to the heathen of Northern Europe, from the Roman gods to the gods of Lithuania, that part of Europe in which heathendom held longest open sway. The long list of Lithuanian deities shows a host of significant names from A to Z, from Auscantum, 'the buzzardess' or goddess of the bee, to Zelus, 'the green grower,' who is the god of the grass. We are back again in the realm of the *indigitamenta*. A similar partition of the realm of good and evil is familiar to the student of hagiology. Every one knows that each trade has its patron saint, that St. Hubert is the patron of the hunter and that the shoemaker is jocularly called a Knight of St. Crispin. St. Anthony cares for the swine, St. Barbara averts death in battle, and St. Joseph is invoked by those who are in quest of partners for life, as in that charming little story *La Neuvaîne de Colette*. These have entered into the inheritance of the ancient specialists. Only the names are not so transparent and the personality is more vivid.

The next chapter deals with the Greek specialist gods. In spite of the plastic character of Greek religion, in spite of the domination of figures that refuse to be analyzed, there is no lack of transparent deities, and these specialist gods and goddesses, with their practice limited to one sphere, remind one of the *δημιουργοί* of the Homeric time. To begin with the beginning, to begin with birth, there is *Καλλιγένεια*, there is *Γενετυλλίς*, *Κουροτρόφος*, a surname of a number of deities, seems originally to have had an office of her own. 'Long before the Madonna with the Christ-child could be represented, the ancient figure of the *Κουροτρόφος* appears on the mural paintings of the Catacombs.' *Αύξησης* is transparent and so is *Αύξω*, one of the old Attic Charites. The *Ἵσται* are the seasons, and in Attica there are two, *Θαλλώ* and *Καρπώ*. *Θαλλώ* in the form *Θάλεια* contrives a double debt to pay and serves now as a Muse, now as a Grace. *Ἐρση* is a goddess of the dew. *Βούτης* is a neatherd, and his mother, *Ζευσίππη*, harnesses horses. *Λεχώ* is a midwife and *Βριζώ* is a goddess that is caught napping. The divine physician is Asklepios, but before Asklepios established himself as master of leechcraft *par excellence* there was an *Ἰατρός*, and, according to Professor Usener, *Paian Παίων* is older than Apollo. He is *παντjαν* 'the cleanser,' who makes everything *purum putum*, and *Paian* continues to be honored side by side with Asklepios. *Ἰασος* is another healer, and so is *Χείρων*, who is a surgeon. *Ἰάσων*, the pupil of *Χείρων*, is a healer too, and *Μήρεια ἡ πολυφάρμακος*, the running mate of *Ἰάσων*, belongs to the same sphere. *Υγίεια* is a notorious instance, and examples of Greek transparencies in the field of medicine might be multiplied.

Every one knows the great part that light plays in religion. It plays a great part in ours; it played a great part in the Greek system, and much space is given to it by Professor Usener. *Λύκος* is the light god, and has a far less famous brother, *Νυκτεύς*, the night god. This *Λύκο-* enters into various combinations and figures largely in the names of places, among which Professor Usener counts *Λυκίσουρα*, which he renders 'lichtes warte.' Unluckily, popular etymology coupled the two *λύκοι*, and *λυκάβας*, 'the path of light,' the great year, was interpreted as the 'wolf-path,' so that we have mist instead of transparency.

Now, these independent gods, these specialists—such is Professor Usener's contention—gradually became subordinate to the personal gods, to the gods that had assumed a plastic form. If he will pardon the expression, they were mediatized. *Λύκος* or *Λύκειος* became a mere surname of Apollo. Artemis absorbed *Καλλίστη*. Of course, there are many eponyms that belong properly to this god and that. *Ὀλύμπιος* was fused with *Ζεύς* as *Παφία* with *Ἀφροδίτη*, but, on the other hand, we are not to suppose that *Λύκος* came from *Ἀπόλλων Λύκειος* or from *Ζεύς Λυκαίος*. Professor Usener has himself shown, in his charming book on St. Pelagia, how the surnames of Aphrodite-Venus have hypostatized themselves in sacred legend, but here we are on different ground.

The main divinity of a place was naturally called *ἄναξ* or *ἄνασσα*, *δεσπότης*, *δέσποινα* (*πότνια*), later *κύριος*, *κυρία*. Baal means simply 'lord.' Marna, the god of Gaza, survives in the Christian formula Maranatha. So in Latin we have Dominus and Era. In fact, one of the saints in the calendar bears the name Domna. *Δέσποινα* is largely identified with Persephone, but she is

separated from her in the cult of the Peloponnesus. Πότνια at the time of Theokritos was one with Κόρη. In Athens the two goddesses of the Eleusinian mysteries were Πότνιαι, according to Sophokles, O. C. 1050, but the same Sophokles addresses the Erinyes with ὦ Πότνιαι δεινῶπες, just as Aischylos speaks of Erinyes as πότνια. 'King' and 'queen' seem made for Zeus and Hera. ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ is a familiar exclamation, and there is but scant trace of an independent Βασιλεὺς. Not so is it with Βασίλεια. Ἥρα Βασίλεια, Ἥρα Βασιλὶς had to give her glory to others; so to Κύπρις Βασίλεια, to Horace's *Venus regina Cnidi Paphique*, to Ἀρτεμις Βασίλεια. The notion was older than that of any personal god, and *Maria regina caeli* of the modern church has a rival in Hindu mythology. The independence of Basileia is shown in the Birds of Aristophanes, in which Prometheus advises Peithetairos to ask Zeus for Basileia in marriage. She is no longer Hera, but a virgin daughter of Zeus. Nor does the identification with Athens shake the theory. Then there is a Βασίλη who had been carried off by one Echelos or 'Holdfast,' and who had a sanctuary opposite the palaestra of Taureas at Athens.

In the same way many local gods who bore the surnames of their respective localities become subordinated and shrink into mere surnames. Ἥρα Ἀργεῖα is Hera of Argos, but Ἀργεῖα is a goddess of light, and the Ἥρα Ἀργεῖα of Sparta was never a Hera of Argos. So gods of the field once autonomous become eponymous, and from the long list of surnames, especially of Zeus, Demeter and Dionysos, we may pick out parallels for the figures of the *indigitamenta*. Ζεὺς Μόριος and Ἀθηνᾶ Μορία protected the olive, Διώνυσος Ὀμφακίτης watched over the unripe grape, and, like the Latin Messor, Δημήτηρ Ἀμαῖα presided over mowing. In Italy not only the old names but the old deities persisted in the cultus. In Greece the personal gods absorb the specialists. Such of these specialists as are not absorbed must be content, in many cases, to live on as δαίμονες or ἥρωες. In fact, ἡμίθεος is the prose of ἥρωες. The heroes were originally the blessed souls of the departed and were held in honor everywhere, as the remains of ἡρώα attest; and the ranks of these heroes were reinforced by the specialist gods who had come down from the Upper House. An American at once thinks of John Quincy Adams in the House of Representatives. From this it will be seen that Professor Usener does not subscribe to the doctrine so prevalent nowadays, that the worship of the gods is simply a development of ancestor-worship. This notion he considers one of those intellectual epidemics to which humanity is exposed, and he refuses to accept animism and totemism as the final source of religion. The belief in gods, he says, comes from the spirit of man himself, who applies and transfers to what he does not know the most important fact of his own consciousness, the possession of a living soul. Ancestor-worship is not the origin of the gods, and the traces of herodism we see in this god and that god are not remains of the original state of things, but the after-growth of tradition. The myth that makes Dionysos the son of Semele, daughter of Kadmos, and in this way a mere deified hero, belongs to a very late stratum. The same thing can be proved in regard to Asklepios and Herakles, in regard to the Dioskouroi and Helen. These are late processes. Much earlier is the change that turns a specialist god into a hero. In Olympia and on the Isthmus the chariot-drivers tried to propitiate the daimon Ταρά-

Ξιππος. In Olympia they thought of Poseidon, on the Isthmus of Glaukos, who had been torn in pieces by his own horses. Once upon a time this Taraxippos was a god or godling with his choice and select circle of subjects. In the course of the ages he became here an eponym, there a hero. But we cannot follow Professor Usener into all the rich detail of this chapter. Hesiod, he reminds us, put the number of immortal beings that at Zeus' bidding watch over mortal men (O. et D. 252) at thrice ten thousand. There are a good many left, but the transparent figures of the specialists had to be content, as we have seen, to live on as eponyms of other gods or in the lower estate of *ήρωες* and *δαίμονες*, while the opaque names, such as Kekrops and Achilleus, and those which were not sufficiently specialized, such as Euphemos, were woven into the texture of heroic legend.

It has been shown that the principle of the Roman *indigitamenta* is not isolated, that it was at work not only in Lithuania, but also in Hellas. These three alone would suffice to give it a firm foothold, and from this vantage-ground Professor Usener proceeds to survey the field and ask how far these facts modify our historical view of polytheism.

F. G. Welcker reached as the conclusion of his long researches, that the notion of Zeus the Sky as *the* godhead was the root out of which all the special forms of divinity sprang. Schelling in his old age arrived at the view that a relative monotheism stood at the threshold of all religion, a relative monotheism sharply to be distinguished from an absolute or pure monotheism, which is the last result of religious and philosophic development. The vague unity of the One God took different forms at different times, and the different aspects led in the process of the ages to the development of distinct gods. We revert to the old story of the Tower of Babel and the scattering abroad of the peoples. Now, the subject can be attacked from different sides. The names of the months, which are derived, as a rule, from the main festival of each month or from the god celebrated at the festival, yield interesting and important results. Another side is presented by old sacral traditions, by the traces of human sacrifices, of fetich worship, which lead to conclusions as to the special antiquity of such and such gods. Nor would it be unremunerative to study the religion of those peoples to the North and East of Hellas, who, though akin to the Greeks, were regarded as barbarians simply because they had been left behind in the march of culture. All these fields of observation yield the same result. The same four or five gods come out as the earliest stock. The next step is to regard the heroes as hypostases of the attributes of well-known gods. A stride, and these few gods, these four or five, are the emanations of the one god Zeus, all with the exception of the one goddess that matches the one god.

Now, as Professor Usener well says, a thought must be thought out, must be pushed to its consequences, before we can be convinced whether it is tenable or not; and after pursuing this line of thought for some time, he felt his feet slipping from under him. The hypostases lacked staying power. Finally, the study of the Lithuanian gods relieved him of the painful feeling. He had to turn back, he had to learn the lesson backward, and has come to the conclusion which is embodied in this work. Only finite phenomena, finite relations, can call forth the feeling of the infinite—not *the* infinite, as we

understand it, but something infinite—and so there arises an indefinite series of notions of god, all which have at first independent value. We who are accustomed to the thought of one god can conceive of such divine forms only as manifestations or emanations of deity, but we are not to confound the feeling and thought of the childhood of humanity with our own. We must learn to feel and think with the early time, and then we shall be able to understand how, from the mass of homogeneous specialist gods, personal gods arise, and how the plenitude of power of the personal gods brings polytheism to monotheism, to the *εἰς κοίρανος ἔστω*. To be sure, none of the prominent members of our family of peoples has remained in the stage at which only specialist gods are known. But there were others, such as the *Καλλιαῖκοί*, forlorn outposts of the Kelts beyond the Pyrenees, whom Strabo (3, 164) calls *ἄθεοι* because their gods were nameless, that is, had no proper names. There were Thracian *ἄθεοι* of the same order mentioned by Theophrastos (ap. Porphy. de abstinentia 2, 8), whose gods lacked proper names as well as those of the *Καλλιαῖκοί*. So too at a later day the Christians were called *ἄθεοι*, not that they had no god, but because they withheld from the personal gods of the heathen the tribute that was their due. Hence the cry *αἶρε τοὺς ἄθεους*. And now we are able to understand what Herodotos (2, 52) tells us of the Pelasgi, that they brought all manner of offerings to the gods, but had no proper names, no surnames, for any of them.¹ From these facts Professor Usener comes to the conclusion that at the time of the parting of the ways of our family of peoples between East and West, the concrete personal gods had not yet established themselves, that the specialist gods still held sway.

From these specialist gods, however, we must descend to a still lower grade, to the conception of a god that, so to speak, perishes with the using, a god that emerges in response to a momentary impulse, a momentary feeling. Such momentary gods we find in the Lithuanian system. Such a god is the one that is formed by the last harvest sheaf before which, as in the Biblical narrative, the other sheaves make obeisance. It was a manner of fetich of what we have a trace in the old harvest song, the old *οὔλος ιούλος* song. *Iulos* was a deity, *Eiresione* was a deity. The Macedonians worshipped *Keraunos* 'the thunderbolt' as an independent god, and all will remember the reverence paid to meteoric stones. The Moon is the month and Helios is the day. In the curious passage *πάρος τοι δαίμονα δώσω* (Θ 166), an un-Homeric passage according to commentators, new and old, the schoolboy rendering 'I will give you the deuce first,' though startlingly modern, is not so far from Professor Usener's contention. *δαίμονα*, then, is really *κακὸν δαίμονα*. What could be more shifty than the *δαίμων* or the expression that occurs so often, *ὁ παρὼν δαίμων* 'the sprite that attends us now'? From this point of view anything can become a god, as was said at the beginning of this review. '*Ἀναίδεια* does not stand on a different plane from the Andrian '*Ἀμηχανίη* whose acquaintance we made a while ago. But the Greek *δαίμων* is faint and vague in comparison

¹ Justin Martyr recurs repeatedly to the namelessness of God. *Apol.* 1, 10. 61; 2, 6, in which last passage he says: *ὄνομα τῷ πάντων πατρὶ θεόν, ἀγεννήτω ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν· ὃ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὀνόματί τι προσαγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ πατήρ καὶ θεὸς καὶ κτίστης καὶ κύριος καὶ δεσπότης οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν εὐποίων καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσρρίσεις.*

with the Italic *genius*. This is the word which language uses as a general term to designate an infinite number of individual notions. Every man, every society, every body of troops, every town has a *genius*. And what *genius* is to a man, *Iuno* is to a woman. Nay, in her relation to men, every woman has a *Venus*. *Lugete o Veneres* is an Italic conception. The Greek does not use 'Ἀφροδίται thus. In the imperial times the power of begetting gods for the nonce did not forsake the old Roman religion. Everything that belonged to an emperor was deified—his outgoing, *Profectus Augusti*, and his incoming, *Reditus Augusti*. All the qualities of the emperor, his Justice, his Severity, all his moods, his Hilarity, his Gladness, all his blessings, his Happiness, his Hope, stand out as individuals. These also are extemporized gods that respond to the feelings of the mass of the people.¹

At last we come to the gods that are gods, to the personal gods, the opaque gods, if we choose to call them so, in contrast to the more shadowy gods that have followed thus far every step of human life, in contrast to those gods of whom the words of Euripides hold good:

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χωρὶς ἀνθρώποις θεῶν.

It is hard for us to renew in ourselves the state of mind of those antique souls who called these gods into being and then believed on them, according to the saying (Tacit. Ann. 5, 10): *fingebant simul credebantque*. But facts care very little whether we understand them or not. This simultaneous fancy and faith is the key to the riddle of the momentary gods, the 'Augenblicksgötter.' The specialist gods belong to a more advanced period of abstraction, to a stage which was over when the poems of Homer originated. In the clear light of the sky which they inhabit the Olympians stand forth in sharp outlines, in bodily presence, things to be seen and handled. Even shadowy notions such as *Oneiros*, the dream-god, and *Até* partake of this substantial character. It is a great advance. But the advance was not due to Homer or, as Herodotos says in a well-known passage (2, 4), to Hesiod and Homer: οὗτοι εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἑλλήσι. Nor was it a special merit of the Greeks. Personal gods had to exist before they could be developed, and that they existed the history of kindred peoples shows: the Hindus with their Vedic *Indra*, the Germans with their *Wuotan*, the Lithuanians with their *Perkuns*. How did this change come about?

The special gods or specialist gods could not have been all of the same importance. Certain gods were more prominent than others. Let us take an example: *Apollo*, one of the most richly endowed figures of *Olympos*. He is popularly regarded as a sun-god—so now and so also in antiquity. But *Apollo* and *Helios* are not the same in Homer. *Apollo* may be a god of light, but he is not *Helios*. The real significance of the god can only be ascertained by the study of his name, which means the 'off-driver,' the *Averruncus* of the Romans. The meaning of the name was lost. Ἀπόλλων was no longer transparent; his original function needed the interpretation of such eponyms as Ἀλεξίκακος and Ἀποτρόπαιος, and this opaque god overbore His Transparency Δύκος just as Ἀρτεμις and Ἑκάτη were to overbear Σελήνη and Μήνη. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*. A like fortune has attended *Zeus*. In Greece incom-

¹ See L. Dyer, *The Gods in Greece*, pp. 37-45, on the deification of the Roman emperors.

prehensible Zeus reigned King of the Gods. In India the too comprehensible Dyaush-pitar gave way to Indra.

So in the history of language, out of the mass of special words reflecting the various impressions produced by this and that aspect of things, one word attains to the primacy. Steed, nag, stallion, mare, filly, colt, charger, palfrey, destrier, horse, all these abide, but the greatest of these is horse. The chosen word becomes a manner of proper name, becomes colorless.

After Eugène Burnouf had proved with methodical certainty the original unity of the mythic figures of the Zendavesta with the gods of the Rigveda, both as to the forms and as to the original significance of their names, and Adalbert Kuhn had extended Burnouf's method, with marked success, to the European peoples, a comparative mythology seemed possible. It was a very natural application of comparative philology, and rested on the assumption that the prehistoric notions of gods and heroes had found their final expression in language before the parting of the peoples. But, according to Professor Usener, the arbitrariness and the violence with which those who wrought in the new department multiplied the points of comparison, soon lost to them the confidence of those who were engaged in mythological research, and Andrew Lang's criticism of Max Müller is cited as an illustration. The coincidences of language really reduce themselves to a small number of cases, and the few that are left are by no means universal. So the Hindu gods have vanished from the majority of the kindred peoples. The notions of the gods are perpetually recoined; the old word becomes opaque and is replaced by more transparent formations. In Greece the different cantons show the greatest variations in their oldest traditions, and only the advance of culture and the spread of literature have made the Greek gods the common property of the whole people. If this is true of Greece, so much more strongly does it hold of kindred peoples. Like words in this religious sphere can only be exceptions. Out of multitudinous words for the same notion one emerges and becomes, as we have seen, a manner of proper name. This stage once reached, the god develops a new life. Sārameyas, the son of Sarama, is almost an ἀμεινῆνδον κάρηνον in the Rigveda. Hermes, his Greek equivalent, is bursting with life. The Greek Χάριτες remind one of the *haritas*, the horses of the sun, only by their connection with the light of heaven which shines out in Aglaïa. In Greece Ζεύς Διός, Ζήν Ζηνός are rival forms of the same word. In Italy Ianus parts company with Iovis, Iuppiter. Faunus was one of the most important gods of Latium. It is the same name as the Greek Φάων, the divine ferryman who steered the souls of the blessed from the Leukadian rock over the ocean to the land of light where the gods dwelt, and the story how Aphrodite, in the form of an old woman, was taken across by this ferryman has come down the ages in different forms. So Iason bore Hera across the Anauros, Herakles Dionysos across the sea, St. Christopher the Christ-child across the torrent. The connection of the Faunus with Aphrodite is there, to be sure, but how different! He is a *Faunus inuus* and a *Faunus incubus*, a 'leaper' and a 'presser.'

Polytheism receives color and character by the development, by the growth-getting, of the personal gods, by their taking on of form. In the Homeric poems Apollo is what might be called in familiar parlance a 'settled' god.

The two gods Phoibos and Apollo have grown together, and it is an understood thing that Phoibos is the subordinate notion. One says Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων as one says νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς. And so of Ἑκατος, Ἐκάεργος, Ἐκηβόλος and the rest of them. The gods proceeded to annex the territory of the specialist gods, Zeus widens his reign, polytheism tends to monotheism, and the way is prepared for Xenophanes, who breaks resolutely with the theogony. It might also be interesting to trace the high career of Τύχη, who started as a manner of sea-nymph in the olden time and came out a manner of queen in the imperial period, a Fortuna Regina.¹ Then came in foreign gods, then came on the period of syncretism. This was also a step in the direction of monotheism. Serapis united in himself Zeus, Pluto, Dionysos and Osiris; Helios absorbed Apollo and Dionysos, and every one knows the part that Mithras played in the religious system of the Emperor Julian. The old personal gods began to fade out. In early times ὁ θεός stood for any familiar god, according to the occasion—now Zeus, now Apollo, now Poseidon, according as rain or oracle or earthquake was meant. Then it stood for 'god' in general. Then came τὸ θεῖον, τὸ δαιμόνιον. Ζεύς gave way to his attribute Μέγιστος, Iuppiter to Aeternus Sanctus, and finally we reach the stage at which Πάνθεος appears. Only Pantheus would not satisfy the old craving for a personal god, and Pantheus is rarely used alone, but appears mostly tacked on to Iuppiter, Priapus or Serapis. The monotheistic revelation of Judea found a world that was ready for it, and entered upon the career which Professor Usener has traced in several of his earlier writings, a career in which the old seeds of popular belief bore fruit upward in the figures of the hagiology.

We now turn to the reverse of the process, the degradation of the names of the gods to names for the children of men. Here the old saying, *omen nominis quaerunt*, has its application. There were *fausta nomina*, 'lucky names.' There were names that belonged to certain professions. There were Asklepiads on the island of Kos and elsewhere, there were Cheironids at Demetrias. The θεοὶ πατέρες were held in honor, and names were taken from the calendar as in modern times. These names appear now with suffixes, as Ἀθήναιος and Ἀπολλωνίος, now in compounds, as Ἀθηναγόρας, Ἡρόδικος, Ἀθηνοφάνης, Διοφάντος, Ἑρμοχάρης, Διῶναξ, Ζηρόβιος, Διογείτων, Διογένης, Ἀπολλοδώρος, Ζηρόθεμις, Διοκλῆς, Ἑρμοκράτης, Διασθένης, Ἑρμοτίμος, Δίφιλος. The cult of ἄημος is shown by the long list of derivatives, and the Ἀνακτες give origin to a considerable series, under which Professor Usener classes the familiar name Ἀνακρέων.² There are also Roman names traceable to like origin. Mamercus has long been derived from Mamers and Tiberius from the river-god Tiber, and there are others. Even the names of the gods could be transferred bodily to men when the worship of the gods themselves had faded out; and hence we encounter examples chiefly in the later years. Slaves bore the names Eros and Hermes, perhaps on the same principle on which the Southerners named their negroes in the old slavery times Jupiter and Juno. Here the earlier time and the later time meet. In the earlier days the Βάκχοι or Βάκχαι called themselves by the name of the god whom they served and on occasion represented. The maidens who were consecrated to the service of Artemis of Brauron were called Ἀρκτοί.

¹ See Allègre, *Étude sur la déesse grecque Tyché*. Paris, 1889.

² See A. J. P. III 463.

But according to Professor Usener the whole world of Greek proper names is full of gods, and the presumption that any name is in some way taken from the calendar, as are Christian names in Continental Europe, cannot be considered extravagant. In fact the specialist gods as well as the personal gods have left their traces all over the onomasticon of Greece.

But how is it with the names that present the idea of the divinity in an 'abstract' form? Such names as Deimos and Phobos and Eris, such names as Kydoimos and Ker in the Iliad, such names as Chaos and Nyx and Hemere in Hesiod, to say nothing of such a gang of personifications as we find in the Aeneid, 6, 274 foll.? They swarm, as every one knows, in late poetry, as the belief in personal gods dies out. See Nonnos for Greek; see Claudian for Latin. But there were numbers of them in the earlier time. They were shadowy, they were bloodless, but that was due to the transparency of their names. They lacked the mystery of the personal gods. They were mere abstracts. But let me ask here, What are abstracts? Did language have any abstracts to begin with? That is a question that must have thrust itself upon every thoughtful teacher of Greek. Our grammars of every degree joyously make categories for abstract and concrete, and have done so for generations, without asking whether the language with which they are dealing recognizes these categories. *σῶμα* is supposed to be the equivalent of 'abstract,' *πράγμα* of 'concrete.' How futile! And as a grammarian I am glad to see that Professor Usener is about to take the field against these notions, which have done no little harm in perverting the linguistic feeling of the students of Greek. But I find that I have strayed from the path which I had prescribed for myself in this notice. Of Professor Usener's mythological combinations I have no right to judge; still less, if possible, of the etymological portions of his treatise, and I am afraid that the outline I have given is as pale and bloodless as some of the shadowy figures of which he speaks at the end of the book. Still, this summary will not have been written in vain, if it incite some student to the perusal of a work which is marvellous for its wealth of learning, valuable for its manifold suggestiveness, and delightful for its limpid and sparkling style.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

Plauti Comoediae. Recensuit et emendavit F. LEO. Berolini, vol. I (Amphitrupo-Mercator), 1895; vol. II (Miles-Vidularia), 1896.

Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie von F. LEO. Berlin, 1895.

In 1875 Ussing, in the preface to the first volume of his complete edition of Plautus, after expressing his high appreciation of Ritschl's labors, criticised him because "suo saepe iudicio plus tribuens quam antiquorum testimoniis dum et sententias ad summum nitorem exigere conatur textum constituit non inelegantem quidem sed nec satis fidum nec non saepius a Plauti sermone et sensu alienum," etc. This attitude of Ussing brought down upon him the sharpest criticism of the Ritscheliens, so that he was obliged to protest against it in his second volume. Who would have thought that the same severe critics, after carrying Ritschl's edition to a brilliant termination and producing